DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 909 HE 004 777

AUTHOR	Barrett, Laurence; And Others
TITLE	Report of a Visit to the University Without Walls by the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities Yellow Springs, Ohio, May, 1972 for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.
INSTITUTION	North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE	May 72
NOTE	26p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Experiments; *Experimental Colleges; *Experimental Curriculum; *External Degree Programs; *Higher Education; *Open Education; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*University Without Walls

ABSTRACT

This document, reporting on a visit to the University Without Walls (UWW) of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, opens with a definition of the Union. When the Union applied for Correspondent Status in the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, it was agreed that the decision should be based on the evaluation of teams visiting 8 of the 20 UWW units now active. Their findings can be generalized as follows: (1) Still in their first, pilot year, most of the units enroll far fewer students than they expect to next fall. (2) In all the units the staff and student morale is very high. (3) In many units, the enthusiasm, conviction, and willingness to work seem to be inspired by a director of unusual talent and dedication. (4) In some respects, there is a fair degree of consistency among the units, in that they all give meaningful education to people of all ages off-campus and outside of the classroom. (5) Because the union does not dictate administrative procedures, in this regard the units show great variety in recordkeeping, attrition rates, and general objectives. One recommendation made was that UWW define its procedures and objectives more precisely and establish methods to measure its graduates against the graduates of more traditional programs. The reports submitted by the evaluation teams are included in the appendices of this report. (Author/PG)

ED 083909

REPORT OF A VISIT

TO

THE UNIVERSITY WITHOUT WALLS

THE UNION FOR EXPERIMENTING COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
Yellow Springs, Ohio

May, 1972

for the

COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

of the

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Examining Team

Dr. Laurence Barrett, Professor of English, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Michigan (General Chairman)
Dr. John K. Bare, Professor of Psychology, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota (Chairman)
Dr. William L. Hays, Professor of Psychology and Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan (Chairman)
Dr. Paul Jenson, Dean of Faculty and Professor of Psychology, Colby College, Waterville, Maine (Chairman)
Dr. Martin Stearns, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan (Chairman)

(Other team members continued on next page)

HE 00 4777

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

University Without Walls

Examining Team

Mr. Daniel D'Agostini, University of California-Davis, Davis, California (Student)
Ms. Rosita Enrique, Herbert H. Lehman College, Bronx, New York (Student)
Ms. J.E. Franklin, Assistant Professor of Education, Herbert H. Lehman College, Bronx, New York
Dr. Paul Heist, Chairman, Division of Higher Education, and Director, Center for Research in Undergraduate Education, University of California-Berkeley, Berkeley, California
Mr. Murray Mann, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois (Student)
Dr. Dan Schlaer, Director of Urban Affairs, University of Colorado-Denver Center, Denver, Colorado
President Seymour Eskow, Rockland Community College, Suffern, New York
Mr. Calvin Tussin, Herbert H. Lehman College, Bronx, New York (Student)

University Without Walls

In applying to the North Central Association for Correspondent Status, a first step toward accreditation of its University Without Walls program, the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities gave the Association an opportunity to test its evaluation procedures on a very new kind of education. At the same time, it required of North Central a review and reconsideration of what kind of entities can be admitted to membership in the Association. The Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities (hereafter the Union) is not an educational institution in the same sense that a college or university is, and does not have the same relationship with the educational programs for which it is responsible. Hence, this report deals with the Union as much as it does with the University Without Walls (UWW).

The history of the Union began in 1964 when the President of Goddard College hosted the presidents of nine other liberal arts institutions at a conference to discuss cooperation in innovation and experimentation. Out of that conference came an agreement to form a Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education. Its purpose was to encourage experimentation and research within each member institution and to increase the visibility of these innovative programs and so add to their influence on higher education everywhere. The new Union (or consortium, which is what it was in reality) was supported by assessments upon member institutions and, later, from grants. Its governing board was made up of the presidents of the member colleges and universities. The initial members were Antioch, Bard, Goddard, Chicago Teachers North, Monteith Masson, New College at Hofstra, Sarah Lawrence, Shimer, and Stephens. In the fall of 1965, a president of the Union was appointed. By 1970, several of the

original members had dropped out and a few new ones had been added, and the name of the consortium was changed to the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities. Late in 1971, five more colleges and universities joined the Union, bringing the total to 22. The Union has received degree-granting authority from the State of Ohio.

The central offices of the Union occupy a relatively small, two-story frame house on the campus of Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio. There a staff of four plus two secretaries assists member institutions in developing project proposals and in funding them, provides consultant service, coordinates such joint Union activities as its Graduate School and UWW (the extent of such services will be evident later), and renders research assistance. The Union conceived and did the initial planning for Change magazine; ran Project Changeover, a three-year series of summer workshops in which college professors from across the nation developed plans for innovation in higher education; and is itself the recipient of grants for research -- a Ford Foundation grant to study the student protest movement, a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health for a three-year study of the "why and how" of change in higher education, and others.

The Union, in short, is not a college or university, not the sort of institution that usually applies to the North Central Association for membership or for a pre-accredited status. It can be called a consortium -- indeed, it calls itself one -- and the term serves, if it is remembered that the Union is not merely a federation of institutions with a secretariat content to administer cooperative programs for its members. Its leadership has made the Union an entity in its own right, a recipient of grants and an initiator of action, a

political force of some strength, and one of the most effective change agents in American higher education.

Not surprisingly, no matter how strongly member institutions support UWW and no matter how enthusiastically they participate, UWW is still the creation of the Union leadership. It was framed by the imagination of that leadership and brought into being by its aggressive drive. In early 1970, the administration of the Union presented the idea to the presidents of the member colleges. At the same time, a full and very persuasive prospectus was written up and sent to a great many leaders in American education and their suggestions solicited. (It should be noted that, unlike most prospectuses, this one proved highly predictive and has required very little modification with time.) Proposals for funding of exploration and development efforts were written and presented to the United States Office of Education and to the Ford Foundation. The prospectus identified the participating institutions and set up a first round of UWW workshops in the Fall of 1970 and outlined the following schedule for the year immediately ahead:

1971 January	Regional Coordinators continue meetings on local campuses re: UWW planning and development Meetings of local project directors and Union staff on UWW planning Expected notification from Ford on UWW grant proposal (mid-January); visits with other Foundation groups Continue planning with North Central Association: UWW accreditation (Submit application for Correspondent Status)	(Local UWW Teams Work on Plans for UWW Units and Develop Inventory of Learning Resources throughout the Year.)

February	Designation of UWW task forces to work on various aspects of UWW planning (i.e. development of new evaluation and assessment procedures; developing criteria for award of degree; planning of research design; preparation and development of Inventory of Learning Resources; developing seminars on Self-Directed Study; use of media and technology)	
	Regional Coordinators continue meetings with local UWW teams	
	First reports (end of February) to Union from local UWW Project Directors on plans for UWW models; proposed starting dates (Fall 71 or Winter 72)	(Local UWW Teams Work on Plans for UWW Units and Develop Inventory of Learning Resources throughout the Year.)
	Task forces meet to plan activities and prepare materials for discussion at March-April UWW workshop meetings	
	First Printing of Union Brochure on UWW Program (End of February; early March)	
March	Regional Directors continue meeting with local UWW teams	
	Second round of UWW Workshop Meetings (March-April)	
	Begin admission of Students to UWW units	
April-May	Meetings of local project directors with Union staff on UWW planning	
	Regional Coordinators continue local campus meetings	
	Preliminary reports to Union on plans for UWW models; first draft of Inventory of Learning Resources	
June	Regional Directors continue meetings with local UWW teams	
	Meetings of local project directors with Union staff	

June	Third round of UWW workshops	
	Follow-up reports from each institution re: plans for UWW models	(Local UWW Teams Work on Plans for UWW Units and Develop Inventory of Learning Resources throughout the Year.)
July-August	Meetings of local project directors with Union staff	
	Workshops and local planning to round off UWW planning	

FALL 71 or WINTER 72 - START UP OF UWW UNITS (Some institutions admit pilot groups earlier as desired; some begin Fall 72)

The schedule is quoted in detail because it is revelatory of the style of Union leadership. The Union originates, coordinates, and pushes, but it does not dictate. It uses workshops and conferences to an extent which would seem to more conservative administrators wasteful of money and time. But those conferences and workshops are almost certainly the reason the North Central teams found the staffs of the local programs dedicated to the point of true believers, proud of what they are doing, and convinced it is theirs and not something they are administering for somebody in the Union's central offices in Yellow Springs. It is also characteristic of the administration of the Union that this entire schedule was carried out with very few modifications, and the flood of coordinating and organizing memos issuing from Yellow Springs through 1971 testifies to its having been an exciting year. It was also a productive one. By September, most of the local units had already or were in the process of admitting students, and UWW was in operation. There are 20 units, 18 of them members of the Union and two symbolic of the principle that UWW does not belong to the Union alone.

As its name implies, UWW abandon the tradition of a sharply circumscribed campus and undertakes to teach students wherever they are and wherever they can

learn best. It assumes there is no fixed age group to be educated, but that some as young as 16 are ready for higher education and that many beyond college age are by no means beyond learning. It seeks to escape from elitism and is particularly concerned with the Chicano, the Black, the disadvantaged. It is critical of curricula standardized by the same graduation requirements for everyone, grades and credit points, and learning only from professors and only through classroom lectures. It questions the widespread use of examinations as the basic mechanism for evaluating students and believes that most higher education is unnecessarily expensive -- that the job can be done for less as UWW does it.

UWW begins, then, with the dissatisfactions so widely felt in higher education today. It is clearly reformist, and therein lies its chief importance and the importance of its relationship to the Union. The things UWW dislikes in higher education are things widely disliked; they do indeed need reform. But it is a fact of academic life that new and experimental education ventures are generally allowed to go their own ways, and are forgotten because they trouble no one. They have little influence on higher education as a whole. Reform within a college or university must usually be compromised until it is piecemeal and ineffective. But as a change agent, the Union is coordinating a very different kind of education within established colleges and universities. Its units are trying things no small group of reformers could have otherwise sold to their faculties or administrations. In other words, really significant reform <u>inside</u> colleges and universities may depend on the backing of a strong change agent <u>outside</u> them, and that is what the Union is.

Being reform-oriented, UWW builds on what might be called counter-principles.

Although each unit enjoys autonomy, all have designed their programs around the following key elements:

a) Inclusion of students, faculty, and administrators in the design and development of each institution's UWW program.

b) Use within each UWW unit of program components which provide for a broad array or "mix" of resources for teaching and learning, to include regular course work, research assistantships and internships, field experience, independent study, individual and group project activities, seminars-in-the-field, telelectures, video-tape playbacks, programmed learning and related media, travel in this country and abroad and other. An **Inventory of Learning Resources** will be compiled and serve as a key guide for students and advisors in the planning of program sequences.

c) Employment of flexible time units so that a student may spend varying periods of time in a particular kind of program experience depending on the special interests and needs he brings to a situation at a particular time. There will be no fixed curriculum and no uniform time schedule for award of the degree. Programs will be individually tailored and worked out between the student and his teacher-advisor.

d) Inclusion of a broad age range of persons (16 to 60 and older) so as to provide opportunity for persons of all ages to secure an undergraduate education and to make for a new mix of persons—young and old—in our programs of higher education.

e) Use of an Adjunct Faculty, composed of government officials, business executives, persons from community agencies, scientists, artists, writers, and other perons (many of whom may be alumni of the colleges), who make their living in other ways, but who enjoy teaching and who bring special kinds of expertise and experiences to the UWW program. An extensive **Seminar-in-the-Field** program designed to draw on skills and experiences of this Adjunct Faculty, will be developed by each UWW institution.

f) Employment of procedures designed to maintain continuing dialogue between students and faculty in both one-to-one and small group relationships. Procedures employed to achieve this include: student-advisor meetings at the beginning and throughout the student's program; on- and off-campus seminars; field visits by faculty and use of correspondence, tele-conferences, and video playbacks.

g) Design of special seminars and related programs to aid students in the development of skills necessary for learning on one's own. Two

such seminars are planned: one will focus on the development of verbal and informational skills (designing and conducting critical inquiries; using library and learning center resources; retrieving and organizing information, etc.) necessary for independent learning; a second will focus on student attitudes and feelings about learning roles and the development of behavior skills that build confidence in one's own capacity for self-directed learning. Similarly, special training and workshop programs will be developed to prepare faculty for the new instructional procedures to be used under the UWW plan.

h) Opportunity to participate in the programs and make use of the resources of other UWW institutions, once these programs have been developed.

i) Concern for cognitive and affective learning, with periodic evaluation by students and their advisors. Each student is expected to produce, before applying for his degree, a **Major Contribution**. This may be a research study, a work of art, a community service, a publishable article or book or some other noteworthy and valuable contribution. Length of time required for award of the degree will vary depending on the experiences a person brings to the UWW program and the time he needs to meet criteria (to be developed by each UWW institution) set for award of the degree. Special attention will be given (UWW central staff and participating institutions) to the development of new evaluation and assessment procedures, so as to provide more adequate criteria for determining individual readiness and time required for award of degree.

j) Participation in a major program of research intended to compare the achievement of graduates of the UWW programs with those graduating from regular programs. Comparison will include measures of both cognitive and affective learning.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

When the Union applied for Correspondent Status, the North Central Association agreed that the decision should be based in part on the evaluation of teams visiting nine (later reduced to eight) of the twenty UWW units now active. The reports submitted by these teams are included as appendices to this report. Their findings can be generalized as follows:

1) Still in their first, pilot year, most of the units enroll far fewer students than they expect to next fall. The average enrollment for the units visited is perhaps 50. This means that UWW has been able to give more personal attention to its students this year than it may be able to give later -- and the heart of the program is personal attention. It also means that UWW has not had a chance to show the economy of numbers it hopes to show in the future. Some units are running deficits. In some, staff salaries are very low. In most, operating money is a problem.

2) In all the units staff and student morale is very high. There is a feeling of being part of the cutting edge. Enthusiasm and a sense of mission pervade the whole community. Visitors found no students who were not very positive about their experiences.

3) In many units, the enthusiasm, conviction, and willingness to work seem to be inspired by a director of unusual talent and dedication. At first glance, this may seem to be in contrast to the UWW principle of bringing everyone, including students, in on the planning and decision making, just as the conferences and workshops would seem to be antithetical to one-man rule in the Union. In fact, while involving everyone in the planning may work in opposition to arbitrary administration, it does give unusual opportunity to strong, convinced, and articulate leaders. The chances of contagion are high. Faith and conviction are passed on by contact. Someone has picked some very good men and women to head these units or, better perhaps, someone has attracted them. In any event, several of the teams came away asking, "But what would it be like if anything happened to so-and-so?" The real question may be what would it be like if anything happened to the leadership of the Union.

4) In some respects, there is a fair degree of consistency among the units, for, in spite of the high level of autonomy, all are convinced of the principles -- or counter-principles -- which are UWW's Articles of Faith. The units are giving really meaningful education to people of all ages off the campus and outside the classroom. That education is not bound by a prescribed curriculum. Because no two students are alike, no two are following the same program. And, no longer time-tied, their education is goal-oriented. UWW is clearly doing what it set out to do. And what it set out to do is no minor modification, no mere gimmickry. It is a basic departure, a brave experiment that deserves a fair trial and respect, an undertaking that may very well become a part of higher education throughout the country.

5) On the other hand, because the Union does not dictate administrative procedures, in this regard the units show great variety. In some, selectivity is very high -- as few as one out of five applicants are accepted; in others, almost all comers are given a try. In some, records are accurate and complete; in at least one, they are almost non-existent. In most, because some faculty and staff are part-time or are, on paper at least, donating their time (actually paid for by the host institution), accurate cost accounting is next to impossible. In some, students see their advisors regularly and often; in others, seldom. Attrition rates vary widely; the amount of feedback from "adjunct faculty" varies; quality control varies. Units also differ greatly in specific objectives and the constituencies they serve. Indeed, the individuality of these units is so marked that visiting teams, while very willing to endorse some units they had seen, were anxious that their endorsement not be extended to all UWW units.

An entity granted a status in the North Central Association must have authority to grant a degree (or diploma, or certificate). Moreover, it is expected to show that it has accepted responsibility for the student competencies for which the degree is granted. This responsibility may be demonstrated in such ways as by examinations or by control of the conditions under which the educational experiences are made available. The latter may include demonstrating the existence of, or at least plans for the development of, reliable procedures for handling and accounting for financial resources; for regulating appointments, promotions, and perquisites of personnel; and for controlling the curriculum and nature of the academic program. The team found no evidence that the Union itself had accepted responsibility for student performance through either of these means. The Union has no provision for Union-controlled examinations, nor does it have control of the conditions under which the educational experiences are made available. For example, in the Union each unit collects its own fees, disburses its own funds, and accounts for them in its own way. With regard to conditions of service, the faculty and staff of each unit must look to the home institution (or, in some cases, to the unit itself) -- not to the Union. Each unit, and not the Union, controls the educational program.

This is not to say the Union should function like traditional institutions. Far from it. But it is to say that, in abandoning the instruments of control by which higher education has assured the continuity of its quality, the Union has put itself in the position of having to find other ways to measure quality, to assure its continuity, and to control those who render educational services in its name.

To date, the Union has not taken these steps, though it appears to be aware of the issues involved. A good deal of time has gone into trying to define standards and procedures for granting degrees, but the results still leave the decision to the local units. The Union has indicated that it has no desire to assess each candidate; that is to be the responsibility of the local units. And the requirements for the degree are still defined in nonquantifiable terms. The judgments will not only be local, but essentially subjective. More important, if the Union does not directly control the awarding of degrees in the local units (or even indirectly control it through the control of monies or personnel), it is hard to see how the degree can be called a Union degree or how the Union can be the entity considered for Correspondent status.

True, the Union's First Report states:

> A committee on the Union-UWW degree will be appointed by the Union Board of Directors. The function of this committee will be: (1) to study criteria and procedures being used for award of Union degrees and to offer suggestions for improvement if these are arise; (2) to share with all units of the UWW interesting new ideas for better assessment; and (3) generally to engage with local UWW units in collaborative efforts for improvement of ways of judging readiness for graduation. The Committee will report on each year's experience with the UWW degree, appraising what has been done and suggesting any desirable changes.

This committee, however, has not yet been activated nor, apparently, will it exercise any other than advisory power when it is.

It should be emphasized that this is in no way a criticism of the quality of education now being offered in most of the UWW units visited. Generally, the students are excited, interested, learning, confident of themselves and

their futures. Nor is it in any way a criticism of the principles on which UWW is built. It should also be noted that those associated with UWW are well aware of what its chief problems are. They clearly understand that UWW must define its procedures and objectives more precisely and establish methods to measure its graduates against the graduates of more traditional programs. They are setting up the procedures to do so. UWW, in short, is a going enterprise and a very healthy development for American higher education.

UNION FOR EXPERIMENTING COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387
(513) 767-7331

July 18, 1972

Dr. Thomas Coffey
Asst. Executive Secretary
North Central Association of
Colleges and Secondary Schools
5454 South Shore Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60615

Dear Tom:

Following your invitation, we are pleased to respond to the Examiners Report on the University Without Walls of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities.

It is appropriate first to express our gratitude for the painstaking efforts of the examiners to set their careful review in the context of our educational philosophy. The report demonstrates that accrediting associations are responsive to the need for alternative programs, even as they fulfill their role of the safeguarding the public against exaggerated promise and rampant faddism.

Our response has been organized under the following headings: (a) The Union as a Degree Granting Institution: Origins and Intent; (b) Maintaining Quality Control of Educational Programs; (c) Insuring Continuity in Program Planning; (d) Planning for 1972-1973; (e) Maintaining Effective Control; (f) Questions of Financial Viability; (g) Organization and Governance; (g) The Union-UWW as a New Kind of Educational Enterprise.

(a) <u>The Union as a Degree Granting Institution: Origins and Intent</u>

Early in 1969, the staff of the Union presented to its Board of Directors (the Presidents of the participating institutions) a plan for the development of a new kind of undergraduate degree program. Called the University Without Walls, the program was envisioned as a degree program of the Union itself. It was to allow for highly individualized and flexible programs of learning drawing on a much wider array of resources for teaching and learning than had heretofore been employed by most institutions of higher education. The program was to be open to persons from 16 to 60 and older. Students participating in any of the UWW program units were to have access to the programs and resources of other member institutions of the Union. Curricula would be worked out on an individual basis between the student and his advisor(s).

University of Alabama
New College
Antioch College
Bard College
Chicago State University
College of Racine
Florida International University
Franconia College
Friends World College
Goddard College
Hofstra University
Johnston College (University of Redlands)
Kirkland College
Loretto Heights College
University of Massachusetts
University of Minnesota
Morgan State College
Northeastern Illinois University
University of the Pacific
Pitzer College
Roger Williams College
Shaw University
Skidmore College
University of South Carolina
Staten Island Community College
Stephens College
Webster College
Westminster College
University of Wisconsin at Green Bay

In effect, the plan proved to be a forerunner of the ideas later espoused in the Carnegie Commission Report titled Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School (published in January 1971) and in the March 1971 Newman Commission Report on Higher Education.

The reasons for seeking authorization for a Union-UWW degree were several:

(1) While the Union had played an important role in helping to effect change at its member institutions, our experience had shown that these changes were for the most part piecemeal in nature and had little effect in encouraging new modes of undergraduate education or in influencing college-wide change. The University Without Walls seemed to offer the opportunity for testing some ideas that provided a bold departure from the more usual forms of undergraduate education and for involving Union membership in programs that had an organic quality of its own, while at the same time providing ample opportunity for the individual stamp of the member institutions. However, if the UWW "test" was to get a start, it seemed important that some new mechanisms be devised that would enable the member institutions to institute these programs in their own settings and to then draw on one another's help in the development of their programs. Thus a UWW degree sponsored by the Union made it possible for the member institutions to take part in a significant experiment in undergraduate education that few institutions could have undertaken on their own. The point made here is perhaps best summarized in the Report of the North Central Examining Team itself. We quote from page 6 of the Examiners Report:

> "UWW begins, then, with the dissatisfaction so widely felt in higher education today. It is clearly reformist, and therein lies its chief importance and the importance of its relationship to the Union. The things UWW dislikes in higher education are things widely disliked; they do indeed need reform. But it is a fact of academic life that new and experimental education ventures are generally allowed to go their own ways, and are forgotten because they trouble no one. They have little influence on higher education as a whole. Reform within a college or university must usually be compromised until it is piecemeal and ineffective. But as a change agent, the Union is coordinating a very different kind of education within established colleges and universities. Its units are trying things no small group of reformers could have otherwise sold to their faculties or administrations. In other words, really significant reform inside colleges and universities may depend on the backing of a strong change agent outside them and that is what the Union is."

(2) A second factor that figured importantly in the Union's seeking authorization for a Union-UWW degree, related to the intent of the UWW planners to develop through the UWW what might in time become a new kind of university in which the various UWW units would in effect be viewed as being part of single Union-University Without Walls institution, with students at any one unit having access to the programs and facilities of other units in the UWW system. This would have the great advantage of enabling students to draw on the resources and programs of other UWW units for particular aspects of their undergraduate experience not available in their own setting. In more than just a superficial way then, the degree to be awarded by the Union was to be increasingly envisaged as the combined offerings of its member institutions. If this goal was to be achieved, it seemed important that the Union become a degree granting entity in its own right.

(3) One of the major problems facing institutions of higher education today is that of costs. It is clear that unless some new ways are found of decreasing costs of higher education - and to do so without decreasing quality - many institutions are in for serious financial trouble, so much so that their very survival is at stake.

One way to reduce costs is for institutions to find ways of sharing program offerings, resources and facilities, thus avoiding expensive duplication of programs and courses, particularly when these are of a highly specialized nature. Not every institution needs to offer its own course in Chinese Language Instruction or institute its own program of study abroad. By achieving a degree entity of its own, and with this entity made up of some twenty-five institutions each of which had its own array of program offerings - the Union saw itself as being in a very strong position through its offering and coordination of a Union-UWW degree - to explore ways by which significant economies in the costs of higher education might be achieved through the sharing of resources, programs and facilities of its member institutions.

Following formal application by the Union and presentation of the UWW plan to the members of the Ohio Board of Regents, the Union's request for degree-granting authority as a consortia, was approved by the Ohio Board of Regents. Commenting on the action of the Board of Regents and noting that Board's action represented one of the "firsts" in the country where a consortia itself was granted authority to award degrees, Dr. John Millett, then Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, called the consortia-degree offering and the proposed Union-UWW "a unique and unusual experiment in higher education that could hold significant implications for all of American higher education."[1]

---

[1]Dayton Journal Herald, "Experimental College Program is Approved," May 21, 1971.

(b) Maintaining Quality Control of Educational Programs

Needless to say, we were pleased that the examiners recognized the great deal of planning that went into the development of UWW, and the care that was taken to see that the plans were faithfully executed. The question of fundamental responsibility raised by the examiners has been our concern from the outset, and we have set up plans to deal with it in the same efficient way as we did in operationalizing UWW.

From its inception in 1964, the Union has given considerable attention to the need for evaluation of its programs. It has called upon leaders in the behavioral sciences to help in designing appropriate evaluation schemas. It has been cognizant from the outset that the problems that always come into play in the assessment of achievement and growth are exacerbated when programs are highly individualized. That has not deterred the Board which has established the following plan to assure that the quality of student achievement in UWW is at least on a par with that of the established programs even if different in kind.

(1) As stated in the First Report, a committee on the Union-UWW degree will be appointed by the Board of Directors at its fall meeting in October to: a) study criteria and procedures being used for award of Union degrees and recommend suggestions for improvement; and b) share with UWW units new ideas for better student assessment. In addition, the Committee will have the opportunity to review data available from reviewing the process and substance of the work done by students who have already received Union-UWW degrees. A first Report on developments thus far is to be made to the Board of Directors of the Union by February 1973.

(2) While traditional student assessment procedures such as course credits, grades and the like are viewed in the UWW program as inadequate measures of the individual's growth and development, a crucial task of the UWW is to find new approaches to evaluation of student learning. Each UWW unit has given major attention to this matter utilizing teams of students and faculty developing ideas about procedures for viewing both cognitive and affective areas of student growth and development. A staff paper was developed by Union staff (see First Report, p. 35) and a clear initial procedure for student progress, both periodic as well as final degree assessment, has been initially specified as the basis for individual unit assessment procedures. A major task of the Committee noted above will be to review the criteria and procedures developed at each unit.

(3) The Union staff will be more active in participating in the degree process at UWW units by reviewing procedures with students and staff during consultation visits and actually participating in degree concurrence meetings from time to time.

(4) The Union staff, UWW directors and faculty will carefully review the problems of documentation and student record keeping. We recognize the importance of this matter to all concerned including the students themselves, however, we also feel the answers should come from the ongoing process of the program involving students, faculty and staff and that units will undoubtedly evolve differing solutions. The Union's task is to insure that an adequate response is forthcoming, and to maintain a permanent record of the resulting procedure, as part of the assessment procedure noted above. A key plan is to share with all units procedures for record-keeping and documentation developed by any one unit.

(5) As the original proposal and the First Report stated, research about the developing, ongoing character and effectiveness of the UWW is an integral part of the Union's overall effort. A special initial grant from the U.S. Office of Education has enabled the development of a research and assessment concept. The units will develop special task forces to include students, faculty and administrators to work with the staff of the Union to obtain evidence and increased understanding about all dimensions of the UWW program, including its spin-off effects and its impact on faculty, host institutions, community persons and special student populations such as minority and highly disadvantaged groups.

(6) During the 1972-1973 year, a continuing special Committee will be appointed on Evaluation of UWW Programs. The Committee will include Union staff, representatives of UWW units and outside persons recognized for their knowledge and expertise in assessing experimental programs. This committee will be asked to bring its collective responses into focus on the effectiveness of the UWW and its operating units based in part on the accumulated research evidence, reports on ongoing operations and visits to the units. This Committee should be of great help in identifying problem areas and new directions for future growth and change. It will also in effect, serve as an internal credentialing agent for the Union itself.

(c) Insuring Continuity in Program Planning

The continuity of the Union for Experimenting Colleges is provided for in the by-laws on the selection of members of the Board of Directors and a President. While any new venture is an experiment in risk-taking especially when it is innovative, our security depends in part on our ability to identify the contemporary educational needs, at least for students who come to our member institutions. As one type of evidence of our viability, our membership continues to grow even as the economic situation in higher education in the nation worsens. The short history of the Union has witnessed perhaps the stormiest period in higher education, and it has endured the difficult strains of a new organization composed of many institutions and yet it is stronger than ever, with more applicants for membership than it is now in a position to absorb.

The Union is young, but its members are not. They are responsible institution-citizens in the academic community, aware of the seriousness of their commitment when they organized the Union, when they incorporated, when they applied for authority to grant a degree and when they inaugurated the UWW. They do not take lightly their responsibility to any of their pioneering ventures, to the students, the faculty and the public at large.

(d) Planning for 1972-1973

As the transition from planning and the first year at UWW program operations has drawn to a close, planning for a second phase of development of the UWW has been initiated. Many of the concerns expressed by the Examining Team and in this report will receive specific attention by Union staff and UWW units. Particular efforts will be made to provide leadership and workshops for sharing experiences and plans on such matters as research, assessment procedures, degree criteria and the like. Special emphasis will be initiated by Union staff to identify potential spin-off programs in which the special resources and talents of clusters of UWW units can form a nucleus for special projects for which the Union can seek planning or initial action funding. Exhibit "A" provides a 1972-1973 Planning Outline similar to the summary used in the early UWW development.

(e) Maintaining Effective Control

New structures directed to new purposes usually do not duplicate old ones. Still, there are striking parallels between the Union in its relation to the UWW units, and many a large university in its relation to its diverse undergraduate, graduate and professional divisions. The coordination and cooperation among Union members, despite the youth of the organization, matches that of units within long established universities.

Already some UWW units are considering joint faculty appointments and the Union is therefore now in a position to establish UWW faculty with some persons in such roles working with several UWW units in a regional concentration. In addition, a Union staff person is coordinating a special project to facilitate arrangements for the flow and interchange of students among UWW units to take advantage of specialized learning resources available at some locations. A Director of Research, appointed in April of 1972, will give special attention to the development of a research plan for individual units of the UWW and for the UWW as a whole.

The control over those who render educational services in the name of the Union is or will be asserted in several forms. First, the Committees on the Union-UWW degree and the Evaluation of UWW Programs will be a source of data on the quality of programs. Second, the capacity of the Union to provide funds for a given program will

be exercised on behalf of units that have a record of effectiveness. Third, the very nature of the organization, directed by heads of member units who have an understandable concern about the stature and reputation of their own institutions, is calculated to make it subject to the maintenance of high standards.

(f) Questions of Financial Viability

One major argument made by the planners of UWW is that the program while maintaining, if not improving the quality of education, can achieve major economies in the cost of education and can in fact become self-supporting through tuitions alone. Because this point is such a crucial one, we quote in detail here from the UWW: A First Report:

"Estimates of income and expenditures show that the UWW program, once fully developed, can achieve major economics in cost and can become self-supporting, through tuitions alone. Furthermore, as adequate numbers of students come into the program, budgetary projections indicate that UWW institutions should, at a minimum, be able to operate without increasing tuitions, and may, in fact, be able to lower tuitions

"Savings in costs under the UWW result largely from student use of non-classroom resources, such as internships and field experiences, and adjunct faculty members from business, industry, government, and community agencies (who often serve without pay). These resources cost much less than regular classroom instruction.

"Significant savings also stem from how the teacher's role is reorganized in the UWW program to allow him to work with a fairly large number of students. (His "teaching" under the UWW plan is principally advising and planning with UWW students, rather than regular classroom instruction.) Yet he provides highly individualized education.

"Still other savings come from not requiring the construction or maintenance of major facilities. Antioch-UWW San Francisco, for example, has leased a warehouse for its operations - office, meeting, and seminar spaces. However, most activities are conducted in the surrounding community through internships and other student arrangements."[2]

The first real test of the cost implications of the UWW plan will occur during the 1972-1973 school year during which time institutions will have gone beyond their first stages of planning and development and will in most instances have recruited large enough numbers of students to enable them to more fully test the claim that the UWW plan can in fact reduce costs of higher education.

---

[2] UWW: A FIRST REPORT, April 1972, Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities.

Of special note here is the fact that all UWW units have budgeted for their UWW programs within the institution's regular budget allocations for 1972-1973. Of particular interest is the fact that several public institutions (Northeastern Illinois State University, Chicago State University, University of Minnesota, University of Massachusetts) have received special appropriations from their State Boards of Control or the University itself for special planning and development of their UWW programs.

The Union has and will continue to obtain funding to assist new units in initial planning for UWW programs and to secure funding for special purpose innovations or new programs. While each UWW unit is expected to be self-supporting, the Union staff will plan to work with units to assist both in budget planning and in unit preparation of their own special project funding proposals.

(g) Organization and Governance

While the form of the Union in outward appearance does not resemble an ordinary college campus, its corporate structure is essentially the same as that of most colleges. A detailed description of the organization was filed with the Ohio Board of Regents and is essentially as follows: The Board of Directors of the Union is composed of the Presidents of the member institutions, and both directly and through a smaller Executive Committee, provides basic policy and overall direction. The officers of the Board are elected by the Board itself. Dr. Samuel Baskin serves as President and also as Chief Executive Officer of the University Without Walls.

The UWW is operated by a Project Director at each institution who is responsible both to the President of that institution, or other designated official, and to the President of the Union. Coordination is facilitated by the Union staff and by UWW Project Directors frequent participation in workshops and through attendance at Union Board meetings. In addition during 1972-1973, a pattern of regional clusters of UWW units will be developed with one Union staff member working with the units in each area on matters of special or common interest.

Member institutions pay an annual assessment fee of $3,500 for services rendered by the Union, including those concerned with UWW planning and development.

(h) The Union-UWW as a New Kind of Educational Enterprise

The Union places major emphasis on its role as a new educational enterprise. While the Union itself does not have a campus in the traditional sense, the emerging network of UWW units constitutes a new concept of a campus. Each UWW unit provides a variety of learning resources formal and informal, on and off campus and in the real-world communities of its students.

Dr. Thomas Coffey July 18, 1972

The development of the concept of a consortia degree, while in itself new, is in a sense not unlike several other large-scale, non-traditional entities that have emerged in recent years, each of which have sought to develop alternative ways for achieving an undergraduate education and each of which departs in its organizational structure and operational plan (and quite naturally so) from those employed at the "single" campus-based institution. The programs already instituted at the State University of New York and the New York State Education Department, both of which contemplate offering a Regents rather than a single institutional degree, other Regents degree programs now being developed in the states of California, Wisconsin, Massachusetts and many others, the proposed National University, and Great Britain's Open University plan are illustrative of the many developments that are now occurring in this area.

Unquestionably, the time has come when accrediting associations will be confronted with the issues involved in evaluating unique new structures. In this respect, the Union's candidacy represents a special opportunity for the North Central Association to set the basis for accrediting entities of this kind, thereby serving higher education in the nation.

In summary, the Union will use a variety of measures and incentives to protect its integrity and to assure the quality of the services rendered in its name. Its greatest strength is in the very nature of the organization, consisting of member institutions that are themselves accredited, themselves concerned about quality control, themselves determined to see the Union an effective instrument.

Once again, we thank you for this opportunity to respond to the report.

Sincerely yours,

Samuel Baskin
President

Edwin F Hallenbeck
Director of Research

SB:rm
CC: Staff members, North Central Association
Members, Review Committee on Union-UWW Degree
Members, UWW Examining Team
UWW Presidents and Project Directors

EXHIBIT "A"

UNIVERSITY WITHOUT WALLS

Phase II: Planning Outline 1972-1973

1972

April	Appointment of Associate Director for Research and Assessment	(LOCAL UWW units complete first year of operation)
June	Initiation of Special Learning Resources Inventory of Project With NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center (Planning began October 1971)	
	Appointment of Regional liaison Union Core staff to coordinate units on Regional basis	
	Material submitted for Summer Issue of Newsletter	
July	Final Review with North Central Association on Application for Correspondent Status	(Local UWW units assess first year of operation)
	Revised Union Brochure published	
August	Reports due to Union from units summarizing and assessing First Year of Operation	(New UWW units start planning ; old units enroll second year students & hold staff and faculty workshops)
	Funding and Selection for units to be initiated in Phase II completed -Target of seven additional units - planning starts	
September	Second Operating UWW Year Starts	(Local UWW units hold student orientation workshops)
	Project Directors Workshop - agenda target: Degree Process and Student Assessment	
	Union initiates planning of New and Special Impact programs for 1973-1974	
October	Union Board of Directors Meeting	
	Appointment of Committee on Union Undergraduate Degree	
	Regional Coordinators meet with local units	

November-
December — Directors Workshop on Degree Process and Meeting with Union Committee

Submit material for Winter issue of Newsletter

Organization of Committee for Evaluation of UWW Programs

1973

January — Report on First Half of Second Year due to Union staff

Regional Workshops for Core Faculty and Adjunct Faculty

Task Force Organized on UWW Journal

February — Preliminary reports from Union and units on plans for 1973-1974

Workshops on Financial Models and Budget Planning

First Report to Union Board and Project Directors from Committee on Union Degree

March — Regional Coordinators meet with local units

UWW Directors meeting - Workshops

April — Union Board of Directors meeting

First Report of Committeee on Evaluation of UWW Programs

May — Report on Budget plans for 1973-1974

June — Evaluation Workshops